| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/585,377 | DOEHLING ET AL | |
|---|------------------------|----------------|--|
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Eisa B. Elhilo | 1796 | |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | | |
| (1) Eisa B. Elhilo. | (3) | | |
| (2) William Valence. | (4) | | |
| Date of Interview: 11 March 2010 | Time: 10:45 AM | | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica | nt's representative) | | |
| Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | | |
| Part I. | | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | | |
| Claims discussed: | | | |
| All the claims. | | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | | |
| Part II. | | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: | | | |
| The examiner initiated a telephonic intensive with the applicant's attorney and suggested that claims 4-6 and 12 to be dependent on claim 15 and to ancel claims 1, 10 and 11. The applicant's attorney agreed to the examiner's suggestion and authorized the examiner to amend the dependency of the claims and to cancel claims 1, 10 and 11 by examiner's amendment. | | | |
| Part III. | | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| (Applicant'Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | | |

Applicant(s)